1: Gillin E-5 (1932-33)1936 SR9 Carib SR9

682 accident; in all other cases it is subject to retribution. Poisoning
627 may be distinguished from homicide in cases where it is not fatal;
poisoning itself is used as a form of retribution, but secretly, and
[154] in any case, if the poisoner is discovered, the intended victim
feels that an offense has been committed against him. The same
is true of sorcery which is used as a means of retaliation. Prac-
tically speaking, however, if a Carib who has committed an offense
discovers his victim using either poison or sorcery against him as
a retaliation, he devotes his efforts to self-protection rather than
●[208] to counter retaliation. Public opinion supports the use of poison
and sorcery as means of retaliating for an unprovoked offense.
On the other hand, the use of these measures because of mere
dislike, sadism, drunkenness, or anger is regarded as offensive and
properly to be punished.

685 Theft is the misappropriation of another individual's property.
All goods are individually owned among the Caribs. A man owns,
for instance, his field, house, hunting and fishing equipment,
canoes, ornaments, tools, the game he has bagged. A woman
owns the implements which she uses in field and house, the pottery
which she makes or acquires, the basketry (which is made, how-
ever, by the male members of the family), her clothing and orna-
[177] ments. Where the Indians have come in contact with prospectors
for gold, each man has private ownership in the gold creeks which
424 he has discovered and which he may sell. A sorcerer and a medicine
551 man each has ownership in his techniques and knowledge. All
the foregoing types of property are alienable in one way or another.
But each individual may also be said to own his or her personal
name, which is alienable under no circumstances. To prevent theft
and magical misuse of the personal name, an Indian guards it
closely and allows only trusted intimates to know what it is.
Names, for example, Big Frog, Curly Hair, Haimara (a fish), are
invented by the mother and given to the child in infancy. They
are based on supposed resemblance of the child to some animal
and imply a faint spiritual bond between the person and said
animal.[1] Communally held forms of property, if they may be so
called, are certain songs and traditions.

000 As in many primitive communities, in spite of the importance

[1] This is, however, only a hint of personal totemism or guardian spirit concept. I have found no trace of a set of formulated rights and duties between the person and the animal involved.